

ROCKY FLATS CITIZENS ADVISORY BOARD

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION

September 7, 1995

FACILITATOR: Reed Hodgin, AlphaTRAC

Eugene DeMayo called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT: Alan Aluisi, Jan Burda, Lloyd Casey, Tom Clark, Tom Davidson, Eugene DeMayo, Mike Freeman, Tom Gallegos, Kathryn Johnson, Sasa Jovic, Mike Keating, Beverly Lyne, Tom Marshall, LeRoy Moore, Linda Murakami, David Navarro, Gary Thompson / Jim Hartman, Martin Hestmark, Steve Tarlton

BOARD / EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ABSENT: Chuck Clark, Ralph Coleman, Jack Kraushaar, Albert Lambert

PUBLIC / OBSERVERS PRESENT: Kenneth Werth (citizen); L. Cone (ASG); L. Helmerick (DOE/CED); Al Schubert (K-H); Joe F. Rippetoe (citizen); Frank W. Smith (citizen); Robert Warther (DNFSB); Doug Young (Governor's Office); Don Scrimgeour (citizen); T. DuPont (citizen); Sheldon Anderson (RFETS); Jill Paukert (K-H); Bob Pressey (Tech. App.); Ken Alkema (Jacobs Engineering); Cliff Villa (EPA); Dave Moody (LANL); Duane Catlett (LANL); Kathleen and Les Johnson (citizens); R. T. Prenciak (citizen); Kay Ryan (SWEIS); S. Dover (Dover Consulting); Sam Cole (PSR)

PRESENTATION - INTERIM END STATE PROJECT WORK PLAN (Allen Schubert, Kaiser-Hill; and Frazer Lockhart, DOE): Kaiser-Hill and DOE gave a presentation on their new "interim end state" project. This plan would be complete in 2003, with the demolition of all buildings on-site except a plutonium vault, a waste storage building and some office buildings. Plutonium would be stabilized and consolidated, landfills would be closed, and OUs would be closed out. The eight-year plan would cost approximately \$5 billion. By 2003, there would be a site population of less than 500 and the site would have an annual operating cost of no more than \$50 million.

Q/A Session:

Question: I wonder how this plan will affect what will finally come out of Rocky Flats, such as the final cleanup levels, deferred work, etc. It looks like the plan is to cut the

ADMIN RECORD

overhead and to bury as much waste on-site as possible and leave it. Under some circumstances that is allowed, but the citizens of the area would like it cleaned up to a much higher level. Could you address those issues?

Answer: There are a couple of realities that the plan tries to address. Because of national political issues, plutonium will probably not leave the site soon - it has nowhere to go, so we want to put in a safe position for the near term. Also, some of the waste forms don't have any place to go until WIPP opens. Some interim closures may be done to standards that would be the final closure. But we don't have the final answers; these issues are being looked at through development of the work plan. And we're not foreclosing on future cleanup activities. The goal is to address the immediate risks and get it into a safe and stable configuration, and then begin addressing the final cleanup issues.

Question: Can you find better language for this project than "interim end state?"

Answer: We can, and are working on that.

Question: Is there a conflict between the projected burial of buildings and the guiding principle that's stated earlier - that waste will be monitored and retrievable? I assume those buildings are waste and are contaminated.

Answer: The buildings have varying degrees of contamination. We don't have the final answer to that question. The key part is that as Kaiser-Hill looked at this plan, it had a snowball effect, so that if we're only going to have a retrievable waste storage and plutonium building, and a few people to administer it, then you can pretty well take down everything else. If the building can be buried and the contamination stabilized in a manner that's protected, that is being considered.

Question: What is the decision-making framework for this project, and the time frame for making those decisions? Do you expect to know by the DOE-HQ briefing on October 3 whether the community accepts or rejects this? When you bury buildings, D&D work, to what level are you going to decontaminate buildings and what is guiding you?

Answer: The plan has to be compelling, we have to get serious about doing it. Our plan is to have a draft conceptual plan out by September 30. We would be very interested in having individuals be part of the process of writing the initial draft plan. If people believe this is the right thing to do, then we need to go after the FY97 budget appropriations. Regarding decontamination, we haven't even reached the stage of making those decisions. We're looking more at a conceptual level right now.

Comment: The goals are admirable, but I'm not sure how reasonable and achievable they are. I'm also pessimistic that we'll be able to gather the political support in terms of

budget. If we load up on funding and then are not able to achieve a majority of goals by 2003, it would be very difficult to get additional funds after that time. If we are not able to achieve the goals and Congress was unlikely to give us additional money, that closure could be partial or dirty.

Question: What do you mean by burying the buildings, and what kind of decontamination will be happening?

Answer: The decontamination is tied in with the whole approach. There are a lot of ways to take down a building, different approaches to decontaminating. The approaches will cover a broad spectrum of options. When we say bury, some of the buildings have basements and rather than excavating and having a hole to fill, it may be a legitimate approach to fill it, stabilize the existing contamination and cover it.

Question: The proposal for the new plutonium storage building would not include any process equipment for stabilization. One of the concerns I have is stabilization is not mutually exclusive of the goals of this vision. It has to be closely coordinated to stabilize plutonium before you store it, but even after it's stored there will need to be some stabilization capability. The only buildings left will be storage. I'm curious about stabilization activities - how would they be available in this proposal?

Answer: There may be details we haven't pursued yet, but the essence of the concept is there is very little there to create other stuff that would need to be stabilized. If you're no longer generating materials needing stabilization, then we can take it down to where there's nothing there adding to it. There may be some limited capability, but that's in the planning details we're not into yet.

UPDATE - ROCKY FLATS CLEANUP AGREEMENT (Martin Hestmark, EPA):
Martin briefed the group on the progress of RFCA negotiations. The QAT/negotiators are preparing issue papers that describe the outstanding issues as well as options for resolving them and each agency's formal position. These will be delivered to CAB by September 11; the QAT will present this information at the Site Wide Issues Committee meeting on that day. The five main issues of contention are: the scope of the agreement; budget process; administration of in-building cleanups and what are considered non-environmental restoration activities; plutonium disposition; and enforceable milestones on plutonium activities. CAB should give input on the new document so that comments can be incorporated at the RFCA workout session on October 10-11.

Q/A Session:

Question: The package you're delivering shows ways that the QAT recommends to deal with these five issues, or are those five issues still not resolved? And if not resolved, does

it include the agency's position?

Answer: All five major outstanding roadblocks include agency positions as an attachment. In some cases, there is consensus from the QAT on what should be done. In others, we've attempted to propose options.

Question: Do you see any conflict between RFCA and the new interim end state vision? How do they relate?

Answer: One portion of the document we're preparing is a vision. QAT members and the parties believe there is some utility in having a vision of what we are trying to achieve. If we can agree on that, maybe we can minimize some of the disputes while getting there. We believe an end-state would be an important thing to come to agreement on. What they have presented to you tonight is only for the interim. We need to know if RFCA contains any impediments to their plan, and then work those out.

Question: Will consensus decisions on the five major issues be made at the October 10-11 session?

Answer: We're trying to get to a conceptual agreement now, and then submit something to public for review and comment. There is a hope that as few issues as possible make it to the workout session.

Question: Is it mandatory to have the issues defined and agreed to right now? These sound like issues that may be postponed.

Answer: Since 1992, we have been trying to administer an agreement that doesn't address the site holistically. So the scope of the agreement needed to expand. We need to somehow coordinate all of the activities at the site.

PLUTONIUM AT ROCKY FLATS - FRAMEWORK FOR DECISION-MAKING - paper for transmittal to DOE (LeRoy Moore): The Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee has prepared a paper for CAB to submit to DOE. DOE must make a decision on whether it will proceed with its plan to package all plutonium at Rocky Flats in a 50-year can and consolidate the plutonium in one building; the decision must be made by the end of the year. This paper discusses issues that DOE should consider during that process and outlines a framework for making that decision.

Recommendation: Approve paper for transmittal to DOE. Minor changes to a few sections were recommended.

Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Comment: Frank Smith: I want to bring to the notice of each CAB member something that has not been displayed to you in the paper. Vitrification will require a plant, and a high-risk work process at Rocky Flats. It is a matter of spreading the molecules of plutonium across the molecules of molten glass. I would like to have you understand that you also allow the possibility of an active, high-risk industrial activity at Rocky Flats.

Question: Joe Rippetoe: What happens at the end of the month if the government doesn't finalize the budget. Will Rocky Flats shut down partially? What are the plans?

Answer: You may know as much by reading the paper as what I will tell you. What is being looked at, throughout government, is an evaluation of the essential personnel necessary to protect the safety of the public, the plant, the property, and protect the environment - those people who are essential to those activities. The agencies are being asked to look at it from that perspective. There will be an identified core group of both contractor and DOE personnel who will continue to report and perform those essential functions. Basically, we will staff the site with those people who would normally be there during a holiday shut-down at the site. The plan is to maintain that level as long as the government is shut down without funds to go back to a normal activity. We are looking at the possibility of seeing if there are funds to provide for some additional continued operations such as material stabilization if it's determined that would be more appropriate than letting it sit longer. EPA is also undergoing a similar evaluation. Most of the project managers will not report.

Comment: Sam Cole: Frank has a good comment about vitrification. But it's important to remember in this paper that we're not here to make recommendations, we're not critiquing the options, we're just presenting different criteria. Frank's concern about vitrification is covered under the criteria that we used regarding risks to workers.

Comment: Tom DuPont: I just want to applaud the interim end state project, it makes sense to me. The project is ambitious, and if we're not ambitious, we won't get anything done. I'd like to review it when you prepare the work plan, because there may be some problems there. The funding is a problem too. But I hope people will support it and try to make something like this happen.

Response: We do want input on these tasks, so call me (Jill Paukert) and we can get you in the right groups. Also, we're not wedded to calling it "interim end state" so if you have alternative ideas, let me know. The task leaders are prepared to meet in the evenings and off-site with interested stakeholders - we are very interested in getting initial comments.

Comment: Joe Rippetoe: Of great concern to me is the demise of two things that had supported the public: one is on the internet, information entered by EG&G that persons could bring up from their home regarding regulations, etc. Of greater concern is the Front Range Reading Room, which has been out of operation for probably a month because of lack of money from Kaiser-Hill. There are rumors that it will be turned over to Front Range Community College library, it will turn into a facility that will handle a reading room for local, state and federal information. It will be useless as far as Rocky Flats is concerned. I object to doing anything more than putting it back the way it was, and making Kaiser-Hill more responsive to caring for this and having DOE get the information into the reading room. Response: It is my understanding that the materials are going in. Kaiser-Hill is negotiating with Front Range Community College to take over operations as a subcontractor, not just to have a librarian do it, but as a subcontractor with a statement of work and responsibility. We will know the answer within a few weeks. In the interim we have had discussions with Kaiser-Hill about making sure that this particular reading room is open more hours each week until such time as we know what Front Range is going to do. As far as accessibility, there are other reading rooms that are fully functional. Hopefully the temporary flux in this reading room won't have too great an impact. CAB office also has a reading room open most working hours. CDPHE has been trying to get its reading room on CARL, and it is going to be up starting next week so you can access a list of documents available in our reading room.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- RFLII has invited CAB members to a happy hour on Friday, October 13, from 5-7:30 p.m. at a location to be determined. Hors d'oeuvres will be provided, and there will be a cash bar. A sign-up sheet will be passed around for those who are interested.
- There is a Rocky Flats tour for new Board members, and anyone else who is interested. It is scheduled for Monday, October 16 - a full-day tour including the buffer zone, solar ponds, etc. Talk to Erin if you're interested in attending.
- Martin Hestmark is changing jobs, and we'd like to formally thank him for his work on the Board; it has been invaluable.

MORTGAGE REDUCTION RECOMMENDATION (Alan Aluisi). The Alternative Use Planning Committee is submitting to the Board a draft recommendation which details options for DOE regarding mortgage reduction. The committee is seeking the Board's input to and approval of this recommendation. The issue is timely, and a recommendation needs to be forwarded as soon as possible.

Recommendation: Approve recommendation on mortgage reduction. Minor changes to the text were recommended.

Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP (Tom Marshall): The Site Wide Issues Committee is recommending a letter to Mark Silverman asking for stakeholder involvement in the Site Technology Coordination Group for Rocky Flats.

Recommendation: Approve letter to be forwarded to Mark Silverman.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS:

Executive Committee (Linda Murakami):

--**Recommendation:** Approve policy regarding committee membership and decision-making process. A revision to the policy follows: "Committee serves in an 'advisory' and 'information gatherer' capacity. The committee shall attempt to reach consensus on an issue. In the event that consensus is not reached, the committee is charged with bringing all options to the Board, including identify the 'preferred selection' and the 'minority selection(s)'. Individual committee member(s) supporting a minority selection(s) will have an opportunity to present their position(s), either verbally or in writing, to the full Board. Committee members are encouraged to participate in the Board discussion of the options."

Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED.

--The Executive Committee's removed from the agenda its recommendation for CAB to co-sponsor a public meeting with the Lt. Governor and Congressman Skaggs. As the scope and focus of the meeting had not yet been determined, it was decided to cancel the meeting.

Plutonium and Special Nuclear Materials Committee (Gary Thompson):

The committee's main focus has been on gathering information and preparing the paper which was approved by the Board this evening. The committee is also working on tracking plutonium vulnerabilities.

Site Wide Issues Committee (Tom Marshall):

--The committee is working on RFCA, and waste policy. On September 11, there will be a presentation on RFCA, followed by a work session on waste policy. Staff is also working on review of Kaiser-Hill's performance measures.

--**Recommendation:** Approve Tom Marshall to serve as co-chair of the committee.

Action: Motion to accept. APPROVED.

Environmental/Waste Management Committee (Tom Gallegos): The committee primarily is working on the "how clean is clean" project (which will be renamed). At the

last few meetings, representatives from DOE, EPA and Kaiser-Hill have been asked to give their perspectives on the issue. Also, several one-on-one interviews have been given with various persons from universities and those involved in toxicology, etc. Some information has been compiled, and the committee is beginning to develop principles. It hopes to develop a qualitative document which provides guidance and philosophy. The next meeting will focus on developing the product itself. The committee will set up for October, November and December presentations on toxicology, risk assessment, and risk communication.

Community Outreach Committee (Kathryn Johnson): The committee is working on streamlining and updating the outreach plan. It is also beginning to plan the fall/winter newsletter due in December. CAB members were asked to give story ideas or comments before September 18. Kathryn asked for comments on the CAB's new mission of being more responsive to the public - call the office and give your comments to Erin.

Eugene DeMayo brought a proposal before the Board (not on the agenda) asking for public involvement in the interim end state proposal process, and asking for more time to review the proposed project.

Recommendation: Approve recommendation on interim end state planning process, to be forwarded to DOE. The proposal was revised as follows: "CAB recommends that DOE and Kaiser-Hill allow for meaningful public involvement, including the Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board, in the interim end state proposal. CAB recommends that any proposed schedule include timely public notice and meaningful public involvement in the interim end state proposal."

Action: Motion to accept as amended. APPROVED BY CONSENSUS.

NEXT MEETING:

Date: October 5, 1995, 6 - 9:30 p.m.

Location: Westminster City Hall, Multi-Purpose Room

Agenda: Toxicology presentation; RFCA recommendation; outreach recommendations

ACTION ITEM SUMMARY: ASSIGNED TO:

- 1) Make changes, then forward to DOE paper on decision-making process regarding plutonium disposition - Staff
- 2) Make changes, then forward to DOE recommendation on mortgage reduction- Staff
- 3) Forward letter to Mark Silverman re: Site Technology Coordination Group - Staff
- 4) Forward to DOE recommendation on public involvement in interim end state project - Staff

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 9:35 P.M.

* Taped transcript of full meeting is available in CAB office.

MINUTES APPROVED BY:

Secretary, Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board

The Rocky Flats Citizens Advisory Board is a community advisory group that reviews and provides recommendations on cleanup plans for Rocky Flats, a former nuclear weapons plant outside of Denver, Colorado.

[Top of Page](#) | [Index of Meeting Minutes](#) | [Home](#)

[Citizens Advisory Board Info](#) | [Rocky Flats Info](#) | [Links](#) | [Feedback & Questions](#)